

written, notarized authorizations. Such requests in the form prescribed may also be presented in person at the Office of Inspector General, Room 5041, National Credit Union Administration, 1775 Duke Street, Alexandria, VA 22314. Simultaneously with requesting notification of inclusion in this system of records, the individual may request record access as described in the following section on "Record Access Procedures."

RECORDS ACCESS PROCEDURES:

Same as "Notification procedure."

CONTESTING RECORD PROCEDURES:

Same as "Notification procedure."

RECORD SOURCE CATEGORIES:

The OIG collects information from many sources, including the subject individuals, employees of the NCUA, other government employees, and witnesses and informants, and non-governmental sources.

SYSTEMS EXEMPTED FROM CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF THE ACT:

Pursuant to 5 USC 552a(j)(2), this system of records is exempt from subsections (c)(3) and (4), (d), (e)(1), (e)(2), (e)(3), (e)(4)(G), (e)(4)(H), (e)(4)(I), (e)(5), (e)(8), (f) and (g) of the Act. This exemption applies to information in the system that relates to criminal law enforcement and meets the criteria of the (j)(2) exemption. Pursuant to 5 USC 552(k)(2), to the extent that the system contains investigative material compiled for law enforcement purposes, other than material within the scope of subsection (j)(2), this system of records is exempt from 5 USC 552a(c)(3), (d), (e)(1), (e)(4)(G), (H), and (I), and (f). The exemption rule is contained in 12 CFR 792.34 of the NCUA regulations.

Dated at Alexandria, VA, this 30th day of March 1995.

By the National Credit Union Administration Board.

Becky Baker,

Secretary of the Board.

[FR Doc. 95-8336 Filed 4-7-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7535-01-U -

NATIONAL FOUNDATION ON THE ARTS AND THE HUMANITIES

National Endowment for the Humanities

Meetings of Humanities Panel

AGENCY: National Endowment for the Humanities.

ACTION: Notice of meetings.

SUMMARY: Pursuant to the provisions of the Federal Advisory Committee Act (Public Law 92-463, as amended), notice is hereby given that the following meetings of the Humanities Panel will be held at the Old Post Office, 1100 Pennsylvania Avenue, NW., Washington, DC 20506.

FOR FURTHER INFORMATION CONTACT:

David C. Fisher, Advisory Committee Management Officer, National Endowment for the Humanities, Washington, DC 20506; telephone (202) 606-8322. Hearing-impaired individuals are advised that information on this matter may be obtained by contacting the Endowment's TDD terminal on (202) 606-8282.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: The proposed meetings are for the purpose of panel review, discussion, evaluation and recommendation on applications for financial assistance under the National Foundation on the Arts and the Humanities Act of 1965, as amended, including discussion of information given in confidence to the agency by the grant applicants. Because the proposed meetings will consider information that is likely to disclose: (1) Trade secrets and commercial or financial information obtained from a person and privileged or confidential; or (2) information of a personal nature the disclosure of which would constitute a clearly unwarranted invasion of personal privacy, pursuant to authority granted me by the Chairman's Delegation of Authority to Close Advisory Committee meetings, dated July 19, 1993, I have determined that these meetings will be closed to the public pursuant to subsections (c) (4), and (6) of section 552b of Title 5, United States Code.

1. *Date:* April 20, 1995.

Time: 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Room: M-14.

Program: This meeting will review applications for Elementary and Secondary Education in the Humanities, submitted to the Division of Education Programs for projects beginning after August, 1995.

2. *Date:* April 25, 1995.

Time: 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Room: M-14.

Program: This meeting will review applications for Elementary and Secondary Education in the Humanities, submitted to the Division of Education Programs, for projects beginning after August, 1995.

3. *Date:* April 27, 1995.

Time: 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

Room: M-14.

Program: This meeting will review applications for Elementary and Secondary Education in the Humanities, submitted to

the Division of Education Programs, for projects beginning after August 1995.

David C. Fisher,

Advisory Committee Management Officer.

[FR Doc. 95-8762 Filed 4-7-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7536-01-M

NUCLEAR REGULATORY COMMISSION

River Bend Station, Unit 1 Gulf States Utilities Company and Cajun Electric Power Cooperative, Inc. Finding of No Significant Antitrust Changes Time for Filing Requests for Reevaluation

In connection with the applications for amendments filed by Gulf States Utilities Company (licensee or GSU) dated January 13, 1993, as supplemented, the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation made a finding on October 15, 1993, that there have been no significant changes in the licensee's activities or proposed activities since the completion of the antitrust operating license review of the River Bend Station (River Bend). Subsequently, an NRC order and two licensing amendments dated December 16, 1993, were issued which transferred GSU's ownership in River Bend to Entergy Corporation and the operation of River Bend to Entergy Operations, Inc. On March 14, 1995, the United States Court of Appeals For the District of Columbia Circuit issued an Order vacating the NRC order and the two accompanying licensing amendments and remanding the case to the NRC.

In light of the foregoing, the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation has reviewed the Court of Appeals decision in *Cajun Electric Cooperative, Inc. v. FERC*, 28 F.3d 173 (D.C. Cir. 1994) and the earlier findings in this matter has made a new finding in accordance with Section 105c(2) of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, that no significant changes in the licensee's activities have occurred subsequent to the previous antitrust review of River Bend. The finding is as follows:

Under Section 105 of the Atomic Energy Act of 1954, as amended, 42 U.S.C. 2135 (Act), 10 CFR 50.80 and 50.90, the Nuclear Regulatory Commission (NRC or Commission) conducts an antitrust review of changes in ownership or operator of a power production facility after initial licensing. In situations where requests for a change in ownership or operator have been received after issuance of an operating license for such a facility, the staff has conducted a significant change review to determine whether the

licensee's activities create or tend to create a situation inconsistent with the antitrust laws. The Commission delegated the authority to make the significant change determination to the Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation (NRR).

Based upon an analysis of the extensive comments received in response to the initial decision published in the **Federal Register** on October 20, 1993 (58 FR 54175), information presented in other regulatory proceedings involving the proposed merger of Gulf States Utilities Company (GSU) and Entergy Corporation (Entergy), the staff concludes that the changes in GSU's activities which have been identified by the staff do not constitute significant changes as envisioned by the Commission in its *Summer* decision. The conclusion of the staff analysis is as follows:

Where appropriate, the staff considered the testimony and information submitted to other regulatory agencies in developing a record necessary to satisfy its own regulatory mandate. From the information made available to the staff, the staff was able to determine that the concerns raised by the commenters are covered by and should be resolved before the NRC by existing license conditions. The staff does not believe that the outstanding issues raised before the NRC are germane to a licensing proceeding. Consequently, the staff is providing the commenters the opportunity to resolve their NRC concerns in a Section 2.206 enforcement proceeding.

Based upon the staff analysis, it is my finding that there have been no "significant changes" in the licensee's activities or proposed activities since the completion of the previous antitrust review of the River Bend Station that would warrant the initiation of a new antitrust review. Signed this 5th day of April, 1995.

Any person whose interest may be affected by this finding, may file, with full particulars, a request for reevaluation, not to exceed 10 pages in length including attachments, with the Director of the Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation, U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission, Washington, DC 20555. The requests must be received by the Commission within 10 days of the initial publication of this notice in the **Federal Register**. Requests for reevaluation of the no significant changes determination should be limited to new information not previously submitted in connection with the Director's Reevaluation Finding published in the **Federal Register** on December 13, 1993 (58 FR 65200), such as information about facts

or events of antitrust significance that have occurred since that date, or information that could not reasonably have been submitted prior to that date.

Dated at Rockville, Maryland the 5th day of April 1995.

For the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

William T. Russell,

Director, Office of Nuclear Reactor Regulation.

[FR Doc. 95-8834 Filed 4-7-95; 8:45 am]

BILLING CODE 7590-01-M

[Docket No. 50-318]

Exemption

In the matter of Baltimore Gas and Electric Comp. (Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant Unit No. 2).

I

Baltimore Gas and Electric Company (BG&E or the licensee) is the holder of Facility Operating License No. DPR-69, which authorizes operation of Calvert Cliffs Nuclear Power Plant Unit No. 2 (the facility/CC-2), at a steady-state reactor power level not in excess of 2700 megawatts thermal. The facility is a pressurized water reactor located at the licensee's site in Calvert County, Maryland. The license provides among other things, that it is subject to all rules, regulations, and Orders of the U.S. Nuclear Regulatory Commission (the Commission or NRC) now or hereafter in effect.

II

Section III.D.1.(a) of appendix J to 10 CFR part 50 requires the performance of three Type A containment integrated leakage rate tests (ILRTs), at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year service period of the primary containment. The third test of each set shall be conducted when the plant is shutdown for the 10-year inservice inspection of the primary containment.

III

By letter dated February 24, 1995, BG&E requested temporary relief for CC-2 from the requirement to perform a set of three Type A tests at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year service period of the primary containment. The requested exemption would permit a one-time interval extension of the second Type A test by approximately 24 months (from the 1995 refueling outage, currently scheduled to begin in March 1995, to the spring 1997 refueling outage) and would permit the third Type A test to be performed during the spring 1999 refueling outage, coincident with the

end of the current American Society of Mechanical Engineers Boiler and Pressure Vessel Code (ASME Code) inservice inspection interval. This would extend the CC-2 second 10-year service period to 12 years.

The licensee's request cites the special circumstance of 10 CFR 50.12, paragraph (a)(2)(ii), as the basis for the exemption. The existing Type B and C testing programs are not being modified by this request and will continue to effectively detect containment leakage caused by the degradation of active containment isolation components as well as containment penetrations. The licensee has analyzed the results of the previous Type A tests performed at CC-2. Four Type A tests have been conducted from 1979 to date. The initial Type A test failed; however, prompt corrective actions were taken and the subsequent tests were successful as detailed in Section IV of this Exemption. It is also noted that the licensee, as a condition of the proposed exemption, will perform the visual containment inspection although it is only required by Appendix J to be conducted in conjunction with Type A tests. The NRC staff considers that these inspections, though limited in scope, provide an important added level of confidence in the continued integrity of the containment boundary. Therefore, application of the regulation in this particular circumstance is not necessary to achieve the underlying purpose of the rule.

IV

Section III.D.1.(a) of appendix J to 10 CFR part 50 states that a set of three Type A leakage rate tests shall be performed at approximately equal intervals during each 10-year service period.

The licensee proposes an exemption to this section which would provide a one-time interval extension for the second Type A test by approximately 24 months. This would permit the test to be performed during the spring 1997 refueling outage, as noted above, and would extend the second 10-year service period to 12 years. The Commission has determined, for the reasons discussed below, that pursuant to 10 CFR 50.12(a)(1) this exemption is authorized by law, will not present an undue risk to the public health and safety, and is consistent with the common defense and security. The Commission further determines that special circumstances, as provided in 10 CFR 50.12(a)(2)(ii), are present justifying the exemption; namely, that application of the regulation in the particular circumstances is not necessary to